DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 578 EA 016 139

TITLE	A Study of the Quality of the Preparation and Performance of Illinois Educational Personnel. Staff Recommendations.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE	28 Apr 83
NOTE	62p.; Presented to the Illinois State Board of Education Planning and Policy Committee.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Personnel Evaluation; *Personnel Management; *Personnel Policy; Personnel Selection; Professional Development; Public Policy; *School Personnel; Staff Development; State Boards of Education; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

As part of a study initiated by the Illinois State Board of Education to provide information on which to base personnel policy for the state's schools, this report presents staff recommendations for future state policy governing all certified educational personnel. Recommendations cover the essential areas of personnel programs, including (1) recruitment, (2) assessment of training programs for certification, (3) assessment of personnel by local districts, and (4) professional development opportunities. For each of the four areas of concern, the study reviews present policy and its impact on workers and summarizes the findings and suggestions of advisory panels. Moreover, each section identifies possible solutions, drawn from various sources, for the problems arising from present policies and then presents in serial form the staff's recommendations for State Board of Education consideration. (JW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235578

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Reisinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA

A STUDY OF THE QUALITY OF THE PREPARATION AND PERFORMANCE OF ILLINOIS EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

EA 016 139

A STUDY OF THE
QUALITY OF THE PREPARATION AND PERFORMANCE
OF ILLINOIS EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

PRESENTED TO THE ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

PLANNING AND POLICY COMMITTEE

APRIL 28, 1983

June 1, 1983

Dear Friends of Education:

For the past two years, the Illinois State Board of Education has been engaged in a major study of the quality of the preparation and performance of Illinois educational personnel.

This study has been facilitated by the willingness of school districts and teacher education institutions to provide information regarding their policies and practices. The cooperative character of this study is further exemplified by several educational associations nominating individuals to serve on external reactor panels which identified problems needing attention and suggesting solutions to them. I want to thank the following organizations for nominating individuals to serve on these panels:

Illinois Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Illinois Association of Principals
Illinois Association of Private Colleges in Teacher Education
Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents
Illinois Association of School Administrators
Illinois Association of School Boards
Illinois Association of Teacher Educators
Illinois Education Association
Illinois Federation of Teachers

I also thank the more than thirty individuals who served on these panels. Their names are listed in the report describing the outcomes of the panels' deliberations, External Reactor Panel Reports, which is available by contacting Dr. Larry Freeman at the Illinois State Board of Education.

Staff recommendations emerging from this study, contained in the attached report, were presented to the Board's Planning and Policy Committee on April 27, 1983. To continue the cooperative nature of this study and to assist the Committee in its further consideration of the report and development of recommendations for the Board, you are invited to submit written responses to the report and the recommendations. These responses should be submitted by September 1, 1983, to Mrs. Judy Carmody, Illinois State Board of Education, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777.

Public hearings will also be held beginning in September. You will be notified of the times and locations of these hearings.

We anticipate the Illinois State Board of Education receiving the Planning and Policy Committee's recommendations shortly after completion of the public hearings and action by the Illinois State Board of Education in late 1983.

Sincerely,

Edward Copeland

Edward Copeland
Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS. 3

SCOPE OF STUDY 11

RECRUITMENT OF PROSPECTIVE PERSONNEL 14

ECONOMIC INCENTIVES. 15
NON-ECONOMIC INCENTIVES. 18

ASSESSMENT IN PREPARATION PROGRAMS 21

ASSESSMENT IN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS 21
ASSESSMENT IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS. 23

ASSESSMENT OF PERSONNEL BY LOCAL DISTRICTS 28

RECRUITING AND HIRING. 28
ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE. 31

STAFF DEVELOPMENT. 39

ORGANIZATIONAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT 42
BEGINNING AND RETURNING PERSONNEL. 45
RENEWAL OF CERTIFICATES. 46

FOOTNOTES. 51

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The Illinois State Board of Education initiated a Study of the Quality of Preparation and Performance of Illinois Educational Personnel in 1981. According to the study plan adopted by the Board, the purpose of the study was to "provide the Board information and data upon which to consider additional policy on teacher education, certification, and assessment of educational professionals" and to act on the Board's goal to review periodically "teacher education/certification standards compatible with educational needs." The study was designed to focus on a number of areas of public and professional concern that have been, and continue to be, described in the mass media, national and state studies of education, and research and scholarship. These areas of concern include:

- Recruitment: Do those attracted into the education professions exhibit the characteristics desired of prospective teachers, administrators, and school service personnel?

- Assessment in Preparation Programs: Is the assessment of a candidate's academic and practical performance during preparation sufficiently rigorous?

- Recruiting and Hiring by Districts: To what extent have local districts been able to recruit and hire personnel with the preparation that will most likely respond to district needs?

- Evaluation of Performance: What success have districts experienced in evaluating the performance of professionals and, as a result, improving their performance?

- Staff Development: Are those engaged in teaching, administering, and providing school personnel services adequately supported in the continued development of knowledge and skills necessary to improve their performance as district goals and need may require?

Actions of Other States

As a part of this study, Illinois State Board of Education staff prepared a report summarizing recent developments and changes in personnel assessment programs and policies in other states. This report indicates that several other states have examined the areas of concern identified above and, in many instances, have initiated significant changes in their programs and policies. Examples of actions by other states include the following:

- Recruitment: In Florida, a Joint Legislative and Executive Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement has recommended development of a program providing incentives designed to attract highly qualified individuals into teaching. These incentives include scholarships and loans, a magnet program for talented teachers, support for prospective minority teachers, and salary incentives.[1] In New York, similar recommendations have been proposed.[2]

- Assessment in Preparation Programs: Several states have developed policy under which individuals must score at specified levels on examinations in order to be admitted to preparation programs, to secure a certificate, or both. Nine states have established required testing with minimum cut-off scores as one criterion for entrance into a program. Twenty-one states require a minimum score on an examination prior to being awarded a certificate. Other states have established policies requiring a stipulated grade-point average or requiring institutions to conduct competency-based programs.[3]

- Recruiting and Hiring: There is no information indicating that other states have adopted policy changes explicitly addressing this area, except to lower qualifications in areas of shortage.[4]

- Evaluation of Performance: In the early seventies, California initiated a state-wide plan requiring annual evaluation of performance of each educational professional designed to assist in improving performance. Several other states have developed less comprehensive plans which have focused primarily on the performance of beginning teachers. Florida, Georgia and Oklahoma, for instance, have developed programs under which beginning teachers are closely supervised and evaluated for one year and either recommended or not recommended for a continuing certificate.[5]

- Staff Development: Other states have initiated programs in this area that consistently display two features: (1) establishing requirements for renewal of certificates; and (2) requiring districts or regional entities to develop inservice plans. Frequently, recertification is dependent on successful completion of components of district inservice programs.[6]

Staff analysis of actions by other states indicates that a variety of policies have been adopted in response to these areas of concern. However, several of these policies have been adopted recently, and in many cases are only only now being implemented. There are, therefore, no longitudinal or reliable research results available to evaluate the impact of these policies on the preparation and performance of educational personnel. Even when policies have been in effect for some time, e.g., the Stull Act in California, there have been no comprehensive evaluations of their effect. Further, in many cases, the actions of other states have tended to focus almost exclusively on prospective and practicing teachers and have not included changes designed to improve the preparation of other educational personnel, even though research consistently demonstrates the crucial character of some of these roles, particularly principals, in improving schools. Finally, many states have adopted policies relying on examination of prospective teachers and renewal of certificates, but such policies are severely limited as a means of predicting or assuring adequate performance on the job. The relationship between scores on examinations or further academic study and performance on the job has not been established. While knowledge can be measured, the possession of other qualities and capacities needed for adequate performance can be assessed only in practical situations.

Character of Staff Recommendations

The staff recommendations presented in this report have been developed to respond to the various areas of concern as they manifest themselves in Illinois. Therefore, they do not necessarily include some of the approaches most commonly adopted by other states, e.g., establishing examinations for certification.

The recommendations are designed to establish policy for future action in Illinois. With this in mind, the recommendations have been developed to provide a framework for an implementation plan to be presented following Board approval.

The staff recommendations are based on the following considerations:

1) The State of Illinois has implemented over the past decade a rigorous system for approving programs for preparing educational personnel. A recent survey of state policies in teacher education and certification indicates that this system is the only one in the nation that requires demonstration that the programs are responsive to public school needs.[7] The recommendations in this report regarding preparation, therefore, are directed only to very specific concerns in the area of preparation.

2) The staff recommendations are designed to encompass all certificated personnel in Illinois and do not, like policies adopted in some other states, focus almost exclusively on classroom teachers.

3) The recommendations propose a comprehensive program affecting the entire continuum of preparing and improving personnel, from recruitment of prospective personnel to continuing development. They do not, like policies adopted in some other states, focus on only one part of the continuum, e.g., certification.

4) These recommendations, unlike some policies adopted by other states, do not seek to place responsibility for competence or performance exclusively on the individual professional but recognize that improvement of individual performance is likely to require systematic support from preparatory institutions and school districts.

5) The policies proposed by the staff adopt an approach under which the responsibility for development of practices and strategies designed to secure improvement is placed as much as possible at the institutional or local levels, with the state's role essentially limited to assessing the effectiveness of these practices and strategies.

6) The staff recommendations view policy affecting personnel as related to policy regarding curriculum and instruction and, therefore, as related to the potential implications of the definition of schooling and the review of instructional mandates being considered by the State Board of Education.

Summary of Problems and Staff Recommendations

The Study of the Quality of the Preparation and Performance of Educational Personnel has resulted in the development of information revealing several areas in which State-level action on personnel matters is warranted. The staff, therefore, recommends that:

> The State Board of Education commit itself to the development of a state-level program designed to enhance the recruitment, preparation, performance and continued development of all educational personnel--teachers, administrators, and school service personnel.

Recruitment of Prospective Personnel

There is little being done in Illinois to attract academically able students, particularly minority students, into preparation programs. Available evidence indicates that the academic potential of prospective teachers, particularly among women, has declined significantly in the past decade. Increases in salaries for teachers have lagged behind those of other professions, and there has been an erosion in public support for and recognition of the social significance of teaching and other professional roles in education over the past decade.

The staff recommends that:

1) The State Board of Education support and promote improvements in salaries for public school teachers, particularly improvements designed to retain experienced teachers.

2) The State Board of Education develop and seek approval of legislation establishing a system for awarding scholarships to individuals preparing to teach in areas of shortage. Such scholarships should (1) require repayment unless the individual teaches in Illinois public schools for at least three years; (2) be limited to the amount of tuition and nonrevenue bond fees at public universities; and (3) be allocated on a 3:7 ratio to those initially preparing to teach and experienced teachers preparing to teach in a new area. This legislation should delete present provisions for scholarships in the area of special education.

3) The State Board of Education develop and seek approval of legislation supporting a program designed to encourage business and industry to provide resources or access to resources for both instructional and professional development activities. Incentives in the form of a corporate tax credit should be provided to support (1) participation in approved professional development programs, including those for educational administrators; (2) providing specialized instruction; (3) providing employment for teachers in the summer; and (4) establishing scholarship funds to support experienced teachers preparing to teach in areas of identified shortage.

4) The State Board of Education coordinate the efforts of local districts and professional associations to develop a public information campaign to highlight the importance of teachers and other educational personnel to Illinois' future, inform the public of the challenges and rewards of teaching, promote the recruitment of highly qualified prospective teachers, and publicize the availability of financial support for preparation.

5) The State Board of Education commit itself to the development of a program designed to recruit and encourage minority students into teacher preparation and teaching and both minority and female students into administration programs. The State Board of Education should (1) request the assistance of the Joint Education Committee in the development of such a program and (2) request the State Teacher Certification Board to review the current standards used for approving institutions and recommend revisions requiring institutions to demonstrate commitment and action designed to recruit such students.

Assessment in Preparation Programs

Available evidence indicates that Illinois teacher education institutions have not, as a group, acted decisively to demand excellence in both academic and practical performance of candidates through establishing rigorous requirments for admission into and retention in preparation programs.

The staff recommends that:

1) The State Board of Education commit itself to establishing more rigorous and uniform standards for admission into and retention in all programs--undergraduate and graduate--leading to certification, by June, 1985.

2) The State Board of Education request the State Teacher Certification Board to recommend by January, 1985, specific policies that address assessment of both content knowledge and practical performance as well as admission and retention standards in all programs leading to certification.

3) The State Board of Education request the State Teacher Certification Board to propose a program for annually assessing the quality of the cadre of candidates recommended for certification by Illinois institutions.

Recruiting and Hiring

Available evidence indicates that local Illinois districts in general have not (1) established systematic efforts to recruit personnel, particularly minority personnel; (2) created job descriptions establishing qualifications for each position; (3) required qualifications exceeding state minimums; and (4) independently assessed the academic achievement of applicants.

The proposed definition of schooling currently being considered by the State Board of Education and its policy regarding assessment of student achievement has emphasized the centrality of academic instruction. These considerations suggest that the recruitment and hiring of all teaching, school service and administrative personnel should center on the capacity of prospective personnel to discharge the instruction or instruction-related tasks associated with the position in question. Further, the heterogenous cultural, ethnic, and racial composition of Illinois, its communities, and its school-aged children compels strenuous efforts to recruit minority teaching personnel and minority and female administrators in all Illinois school districts.

The staff recommends that:

1) The State Board of Education provide assistance and guidelines to districts in establishing qualifications for positions directly and manifestly related to the instructional components of positions.

2) The State Board of Education request the Illinois Association of School Boards, the Illinois Association of School Administrators and other associations and organizations to cooperate with the State Board of Education in developing ways to assist districts in actively recruiting minority teachers and minority and female administrators.

3) The State Board of Education establish a state-wide committee to study the problems associated with staffing and supervising extracurricular activities and offer recommendations in this area.

4) The State Board of Education elaborate the current placement service it operates so that it more systematically compiles and disseminates information concerning laid-off teachers and available positions in districts.

5) The State Board of Education assist districts in developing procedures for assessing prospective personnel, including the use of interview instruments, job-related examinations, and assessment of references and other records concerning individuals.

Assessment of Personnel by Local Districts

The available information concerning evaluation of educational professionals does not enable generalizations about the effectiveness of current evaluation practices. This information does indicate that about three-fourths of all districts have developed written criteria for evaluating classroom teachers, although only one-half or fewer have done so for other categories of personnel. Available evidence indicates that districts may not be engaging in rigorous evaluation of probationary personnel and, where warranted, extending the probationary period as provided by law. Other information indicates that the evaluation process can more effectively support improvement of performance and that there is a need to assist principals and supervisors to improve their capacity to evaluate the performance of personnel.

The staff recommends that:

1) The State Board of Education revise the current rule in Document 1 related to supervision and inservice education so that it specifically requires each school district to follow a written plan for evaluating professional certificated staff which (1) assures that each certificated staff member will receive at least one written evaluation annually, incorporating advice regarding how performance may be improved; and (2) stipulates that probationary personnel receive such evaluations four times annually.

2) The State Board of Education establish a state-sponsored program designed to assist principals and other supervisory personnel in developing skills and knowledge necessary to evaluate personnel effectively that is administered through an Academy for the Development of Administrators and Supervisors.

Staff Development:

Currently, staff development activities in Illinois generally consist of (1) further academic study at universities and (2) workshops, institute days, and other strategies that are severely limited in time and to providing information. Available information indicates that there is a significant lack of staff development programs responsive to district-defined needs and designed to provide the support and time necessary to develop the knowledge and skill required for improved performance. In addition, there is little or no support provided for personnel who assume a professional role for the first time, who return to such a role after a considerable period of time, or who are new to a district.

The staff recommends that:

1) The State Board of Education commit itself to establishing policy regarding organizational staff development that has as its aim increasing district capacity to realize district goals and which encompasses all categories of professional personnel--teachers, school service personnel, and administrators.

2) The State Board of Education create a requirement in Document 1 under which award of recognition requires, in part, a three-year plan for organizational staff development that may be limited to the district or involve the district in consortial efforts.

3) The State Board of Education seek funding for organizational staff development by:

   a) Requesting legislative appropriations for funding of district-wide staff development at the rate of two dollars per student, with such funds allocated to districts on the basis of the number of professional staff members and upon presentation of an approvable plan;

   b) Seeking legislation to increase current certificate registration fees collected by Regional Superintendents from four to twenty dollars annually with the monies collected at the regional level to be disbursed as follows:

      (1) Twenty percent ($4) to be retained by Regional Superintendents and used as provided for by current law;
      (2) Ten percent ($2) to be forwarded to the State Board of Education to support the activities of an Academy for the Development of Administrators and Supervisors;
      (3) Seventy percent ($14) be allocated to districts within the region on the basis of an approvable plan for staff development and on the basis of the number of professional staff members in the district;

4) The State Board of Education request the cooperation of the Joint Education Committee to determine effective policies under which Illinois public universities would be required and supported to undertake significant and effective involvement in district-wide staff development.

5) The State Board of Education seek legislation under which Illinois districts may count an additional five half-days as official school days when used in connection with an approved staff development plan.

6) The State Board of Education develop and implement a Program for Supporting Beginning and Re-entering Educational Professionals by:

   a) Developing proposed rules and regulations that would require districts to develop and implement individualized programs for each eligible professional.

   b) Seeking appropriations to support such a program at the following levels: $1,000 for each beginning professional and $500 for each re-entering professional.

7) The State Board seek amendments to statutes governing certification renewal to require employed teachers, school service personnel, and administrators to present evidence of successful completion of district staff development programs in order to renew certificates.

SCOPE OF STUDY

This study was initiated in 1981 by the Illinois State Board of Education. In adopting a plan for the study, the Board recognized that in the past decade a number of steps had been taken to improve preparation of personnel, particularly through the implementation of Board-sponsored legislation requiring completion of approved programs to qualify for certification, the strengthening of requirements concerning experiential components in preparation programs, and the implementation of legislation requiring all prospective teachers to study about exceptional children.[8] While these actions have provided more assurance about the adequacy of preparation of personnel, a number of other areas were judged as requiring study:

1) The potential inadequacy of the basic academic preparation of prospective personnel, particularly in language and mathematical skills;

2) The potential ineffectiveness of continuing to rely on the inherent attractiveness of educational careers as a strategy for recruiting prospective personnel;

3) The potential lack of rigor in assessing candidates in preparation programs; and

4) The potential inadequacy of school district practices and policies in hiring and evaluating personnel.

These areas were identified for study for two reasons. First, they represent areas of considerable public and professional concern as reported in the mass media, national and state studies of education, and research and scholarship. These sources reduntantly point to alleged deficiencies in the preparation and performance of personnel as one of the major causes, if not the major cause, of the public's dissatisfaction with the performance of public schools.[9] Second, the State Board of Education has adopted a goal to review periodically "teacher education/certification standards compatible with educational needs."

As this study was initiated, the State Board began actively reviewing the "educational needs" referred to in this goal through study of various instructional mandates and consideration of a definition of schooling.[10] The preliminary recommendations emerging from these reviews imply potential changes, particularly further clarification of both state and district expectations regarding the outcomes of instruction. As such clarification occurs, the adequacy of the major resource for achieving such outcomes--educational personnel--requires thorough examination and may require extensive state involvement in a program to improve this resource.

Two other considerations have influenced the scope and character of the study. The emphasis on recruitment of prospective personnel was strengthened as a result of the Governor's request in 1982 to the Joint Education Committee for assistance in addressing questions related to recruitment and retention of talented individuals in teaching. The addition of the area of staff development has two sources: (1) consideration of appropriate state involvement in the creation and support of a comprehensive educational personnel program and (2) information about the retention of teachers which points to the need to support teachers throughout their careers.

The scope of this study encompasses (1) all certificated educational personnel and (2) all elements of a personnel program, including recruitment, preparation, selection and evaluation of performance, and continued professional development.

The study plan adopted by the State Board of Education identified four areas in which additional data were needed:

1) The practices and standards used by Illinois institutions to assess prospective personnel for admission, retention, and recommendation for certification;

2) The practices and criteria local school districts employ in selecting and evaluating professional staff members;

3) The constraints institutions and school districts encounter in recruiting, selecting, and retaining prospective or practicing personnel; and

4) The experience of other states that have implemented state programs for assessing prospective or practicing personnel.

Three reports summarizing data gathered from surveys of Illinois preparation institutions and a sample of Illinois school districts were prepared: (1) District Selection and Assessment of Educational Personnel; (2) Institutional Assessment of Prospective Educational Personnel in Undergraduate Programs; and (3) Institutional Assessment of Prospective Personnel in Graduate Programs. A fourth report, Assessment Programs and Policies of Other States, was developed utilizing descriptions of these programs and policies from a variety of sources and verifying these descriptions with personnel in various states. In addition to these reports, two other study documents were prepared: (1) a summary of reports to the State Board of Education on continued professional development; and (2) a report prepared jointly by the staffs of the State Board of Education and the Illinois Board of Higher Education on the topic of recruiting and retaining teachers that was presented to the Joint Education Committee.

These reports were presented to a series of reactor panels convened in Fall, 1982. These four panels--one each comprised of school administrators, school board members, classroom teachers, and higher education personnel--met for two days to assess the findings in these reports, identify problem areas, and propose potential responses. A fifth panel, comprised of representatives of each of the previous panels, then met to identify areas of agreement and disagreement. The outcomes of the panels' deliberations, together with an overview, were presented to the State Teacher Certification Board in March, 1983, for its use in providing advice and counsel to the State Board of Education in several areas.[1] This advice is contained in the Minutes of that meeting.

This study has identified four major problem areas for consideration: (1) recruitment of prospective personnel; (2) assessment in preparation programs; (3) assessment of personnel by local districts; and (4) staff development. Each of these areas is discussed in the following report. The discussion of each area is organized as follows:

- Statement of the Problem: This section reviews available information regarding present policies and practices and their impact.

- Outcomes of Reactor Panel Deliberations: This section summarizes the most significant findings and suggestions of the reactor panels.

- Discussion of Potential Solutions: This section analyzes solutions to the problems identified that have been suggested by one or more of several sources: the reactor panels, actions of other states, or a review of the literature.

- Staff Recommendations: This section presents the staff's recommendations for consideration.

RECRUITMENT OF PROSPECTIVE PERSONNEL

Statement of Problem:

Currently there is no comprehensive and explicit state-level program to identify and recruit talented individuals into preparation programs in any area of certificated personnel (teaching, administration, or school service personnel). There are no economic incentives for individuals to prepare for these roles, except for 250 tuition scholarships awarded annually to those preparing in special education.[12] There is no systematic effort at any level by colleges and universities or school districts to identify and recruit talented individuals. Although the federal government has historically sponsored programs to recruit prospective teachers, it now provides substantially decreased amounts of money to support candidates preparing in only very specific areas, e.g., bilingual education. In general, current policy relies largely on individuals finding the prospect of a career as a professional educator attractive without establishing additional economic or non-economic incentives.

Those attracted to teaching as a profession while in high school have, as a group, historically scored lower on examinations such as the ACT or SAT than students intending to prepare in other areas. Data from the High School and Beyond Study allow comparisons between high school seniors intending to be teachers and those intending to prepare for other professions. This comparison reveals that prospective teachers do not pursue academically rigorous high school programs, display uncertainty about achieving their occupational goals, and score less well on tests of basic knowledge. These data should be interpreted only as providing information about those attracted to teaching while in high school. There is little reliable data on which to assess those who complete preparation for teaching and actually teach in Illinois.[13]

The pursuit of preparation for other educational roles--educational administration and school service fields--appears to depend exclusively on individual initiative, with little effort at any level to identify individuals with high potential. Though this area has not been studied, it appears that there are identifiable incentives to prepare in these areas:

1) Preparation in educational administration areas (1) frequently results in advances on local district salary schedules, even if the individual continues to serve as a teacher; (2) provides the possibility of moving into administrative roles that pay more and have more prestige and authority than teaching; and (3) increases the individual's professional mobility.

2) Preparation in school service roles results in (1) enjoying the benefits of tenure and other non-economic benefits associated with teaching; (2) working in an educational setting while maintaining identification with non-educational professions, e.g., psychology, nursing, social work; and (3) enjoying the prospect of stable employment because of the heavy involvement of most of these areas in special education programming.

It is unknown whether these incentives result in attracting the most capable individuals into these educational roles. Available information indicates that neither preparatory institutions nor school districts systematically attempt to identify individuals displaying high potential for outstanding performance.

Outcomes of Reactor Panel Deliberations

The panels concluded that little is being done to attract better students into teacher education, particularly minority students, and that there is a need to establish clear and more rigorous requirements for admission into institutions and particularly for admission to teacher education programs. The panels reached similar conclusions regarding requirements for admission to graduate level programs preparing administrators and school service personnel; they could find little evidence that school districts and universities cooperate in identifying potential candidates with leadership potential and other desirable qualities.

The panels suggested the following actions:

1) Increasing beginning teacher salaries to make them more competitive.

2) Launching a campaign through principals, teachers, guidance counselors and the media at the local, state, and national levels to improve the public image of teachers.

3) Identifying and publicizing areas of excellence in public school curriculum and instruction.

4) Encouraging high school and college minority students who demonstrate an aptitude for teaching to pursue a career in teaching.

Discussion of Potential Solutions:

Economic Incentives

A. Salaries

The following generalizations can be made about trends in beginning teachers salaries:

1) In the past decade (1971-81) the average beginning teacher salary has increased about 55%;

2) The competitive advantage of beginning teaching salaries compared to those of six other professional areas on a nine-month basis has eroded over the past ten years;

3) Beginning teacher salaries between 1971 and 1979 decreased from 70% to just over 50% of the intermediate standard budget for a middle class family of four that is annually prepared by the Department of Labor.

While a decrease in the competitiveness of beginning teacher salaries with those in other areas can be documented, there are few unfilled teaching positions in Illinois, except in the area of bilingual and special education. The present beginning salaries appear sufficient to attract the required numbers of certificated and legally qualified bachelor-level individuals into teaching.[14] Further, in responding to a survey, over 40% of Illinois institutions indicated that the academic potential of undergraduates had increased in the past ten years; only 12% indicated a decrease. The non-response of about 42% to this question may indicate a judgment that academic potential had neither increased or decreased.[15]

Yet for the reactor panels, as well as other observers, the central question is whether the present level of beginning teacher salaries will continue to attract a sufficient number of prospective teachers, particularly, those displaying a high level of potential, both academically and professionally. Historically, those intending to teach, preparing to do so, and actually employed as teachers have been largely women. There have been, and continue to be, about three to four times as many women as men in these categories. Data concerning women intending to and preparing to teach indicate:

1) In 1971-72, a higher percentage of women who enrolled as education majors than non-education majors in Illinois institutions had achieved an ACT composite score of 20 or higher. In the past four years, however, the percentage of women in education who scored 20 or higher has fallen 20%, while the percentage of men in the same category has fallen 10%. The percentage of men intending to pursue education scoring below 15 rose only 3% in these years; among women, it inceased by 14%.

2) The sharp decline in the number of those preparing to be teachers in the last decade is largely accounted for by women, particularly by the increase in the number of women preparing in business. The number of Illinois women awarded undergraduate degrees in business increased by 2,600 between 1971-72 and 1979-80; the number of undergraduate education degrees awarded women in the same period decreased by almost 4,000.[16]

These trends appear to confirm that "talented young women who used to plan on entering teaching are increasingly turning to other fields in which opportunities have opened up for them in the past decade."[17] If this trend continues to assert itself, the historically productive policy of relying on a goodly supply of academically talented women pursuing teaching as a career will prove ineffective. This is particularly the case in light of recent claims that potential earning power has become a higher priority for those considering teaching. In a recent study of preservice teachers in southeastern states in which 86% of the respondents were women, 95% of the respondents identified salaries as discouraging consideration of teaching as a career, although 98% of these respondents considered teaching a good profession for women to enter.[18]

Increases in salaries for teachers may be required in the near future to prevent dilution in the quality of those attracted to teaching.

There are at least three ways in which economic incentives for entering and remaining in teaching can be enhanced:

1) Substantial increases in beginning salaries:
Such increases would trigger off increases for all teachers and represent a considerable cost for state and local government. A $1,000 salary increase per teacher would require at least $100 million annually.[19]

2) Restructuring the career of teaching to achieve substantially higher increments in salaries:
Under this approach, the incentives would occur in the form of substantially higher percentage increases after entering teaching. The present percentage of increase, adjusted for factors such as inflation, between the first year and the fifth, tenth, and twentieth year might be doubled.

3) Revisions in utilization of educational personnel:
Use of current teaching technology and of non-teaching personnel to assume non-teaching duties of teachers may permit an overall reduction of the number of teachers and higher salaries for those employed.

Scholarships

In specific areas of teaching, there are both chronic (e.g., agriculture) and potential (math and science) areas of shortages. Such patterns of shortage in specific fields has been a recurring problem in staffing schools. At one time, the shortages were in foreign languages, at another time in special education. The usual remedies to these problems have been: (1) to lower certification requirements or (2) to provide economic incentives for preparing in specified areas.[20]

The quality of teachers will not be maintained or improved by lowering certification standards. Providing economic incentives in the form of scholarships or loans to support individuals to prepare for teaching represents a more workable alternative. As early as 1905--and perhaps earlier--and until 1971, the State of Illinois has had a system for awarding scholarships to support the preparation of teaching personnel. Initially, this system allocated a scholarship to each township to be awarded to the student who performed best on an examination. Eventually, the system allocated scholarships on the basis of high school enrollments and awarded them on the basis of class rank. These scholarships provided, in the words of the 1905 School Code, "four years of gratuitous instruction in any state normal school," and later, all state universities. In the early 1930s, scholarship recipients were required to declare an intention to teach, and between 1969 and 1971, those using such scholarships were required to repay them unless they taught for two years in Illinois. Funding followed a simple procedure. State institutions were simply not allowed to charge such students tuition. Except for the area of special education, this system was abandoned with the creation of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission and a policy of providing scholarships based on need.[21]

As assessment of the effectiveness of this program as a means of recruiting prospective personnel is difficult because of the sparse records concerning individuals except for the period 1969-71. The best estimate from available data is that about 50% of the recipients taught for at least two years in Illinois. The development of a shortage of teaching positions throughout the seventies perhaps reduced this percentage considerably, and no restrictions on the areas of preparation likely resulted in large numbers preparing in areas in which there was no apparent need.[22]

B. Non-economic Incentives

Non-economic incentives have historically exerted a profound influence on those electing to teach, particularly the opportunity to pursue a career oriented to helping others. The power of these incentives, however, may have decreased recently because of:

1) A general failure to promote and establish the social significance of public education and the role of the teacher.

2) An increasing sense, among teachers, of isolation from community support systems, especially as they have been asked to assume increased instructional and non-instructional responsibilities without discernible public support.[23]

C. Racial and Ethnic Composition of Public School Personnel

Of the 1981 Illinois high school seniors intending to teach, less than 15% identified themselves as Hispanic, Afro-American or native American in ethnic origin or descent. Among teachers in Illinois, both in 1977-78 and 1980-81, more than 14% were identified as ethnic or racial minorities. Preserving or increasing the present level of minority representation in teaching may require efforts specifically designed to recruit talented minority students into teaching.[24]

D. Summary

While districts currently have filled virtually all available positions, available information indicates that: (1) salaries for teachers continue to lag behind those for other comparable occupations; (2) the academic potential of those interested in teaching has declined significantly over the past decade; and (3) the lack of additional efforts and incentives may reduce the representation of racial and ethnic minorities among public school personnel.

Staff Recommendations:

The staff recommends that:

1. The State Board of Education support and promote improvement in salaries for public school teachers, particularly improvement designed to retain experienced teachers.

2. The State Board of Education develop and seek approval of legislation establishing a system for awarding scholarships to individuals preparing to teach in areas of shortage. Such scholarships should (1) require repayment unless the individual teaches in Illinois public schools for at least three years; (2) be limited to the amount of tuition and nonrevenue bond fees at public universities; and (3) be allocated on a 3:7 ratio to those initially preparing to teach and experienced teachers preparing to teach in a new area. This legislation should delete present provisions for scholarships in the area of special education.

3. The State Board of Education develop and seek approval of legislation supporting a program designed to encourage business and industry to provide resources or access to resources for both instructional and professional development activities. Incentives in the form of a corporate tax credit should be provided to support (1) participation in approved professional development programs, including those for educational administrators; (2) providing specialized instruction; (3) providing employment for teachers in the summer; and (4) establishing scholarship funds to support experienced teachers preparing to teach in areas of identified shortage.

4. The State Board of Education coordinate the efforts of local districts and professional associations to develop a public information campaign to highlight the importance of teachers and other educational personnel to Illinois' future, inform the public of the challenges and rewards of teaching, promote the recruitment of highly qualified prospective teachers, and publicize the availability of financial support for preparation.

5. The State Board of Education commit itself to the development of a program designed to recruit and encourage minority students into teacher preparation and teaching and both minority and female students into administration programs. The State Board of Education should (1) request the assistance of the Joint Education Committee in the development of such a program and (2) request the State Teacher Certification Board to review current standards used for approving institutions and recommend revisions requiring institutions to demonstrate commitment and action in recruiting such students.

ASSESSMENT IN PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Statement of Problem

Responsibility for assessing individuals preparing for the educational professions has been divided between the State and preparatory institutions. The State's role has been limited to areas established by statute; it has consisted mostly of establishing required areas of study and the length and character of practical experiences. Institutions have been made responsible for assessing individuals completing programs of study conforming to State requirements.[25] In most Illinois institutions there are four major points at which candidates are reviewed: (1) admission to the institution; (2) admission to a specific preparation program; (3) admission to student teaching or field experiences; and (4) graduation and recommendation for certification. These evaluation points have not resulted from State requirements; they have evolved over time and have become virtually standardized in all preparatory institutions. The current requirements used in State reviews of institutions and programs require demonstration of the existence of policies governing admission and retention of candidates and the evaluation of the candidate's ability to teach, supervise or administer.[26] These requirements do not, however, establish the standards to be employed. Rather, in Illinois, the fifty-eight preparatory institutions have extensive discretion in establishing these requirements. As might be expected, these requirements vary extensively at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

A. Assessment in Undergraduate Programs

Requirements for admission to Illinois four-year institutions typically rely on scores on the ACT and rank in high school graduating class. The mean average ACT score required by Illinois institutions is between 18-19; in addition, most institutions require a ranking in the upper half of the high school graduating class. Almost half of the institutions report requiring no distribution of high school work in specific academic areas for admission. In addition to requirements governing admission to institutions, virtually all institutions have established requirements for admission to specific teacher education programs, usually near the end of the student's second year. An overall grade point average between 2.0 and 2.5 ("C" or "C+") is a typical standard. About one-third of all institutions require, in addition, demonstration of proficiency in writing, about 20% in reading and less than 20% in mathematics. The standards imposed through these proficiency examinations have not been documented, but the experience of Illinois State Board of Education staff suggests that the standards typically imposed range from the eighth to twelfth grade levels of achievement. Few institutions apply more stringent requirements after admission to teacher education programs and prior to graduation and recommendation for certification.[27]

Requirements for admission to institutions and to teacher education programs are, however, minimal and represent what the student must demonstrate in order to proceed into the program. There is available no reliable data concerning the number of students who are denied admission to programs because of failure to meet these standards, nor is there comprehensive data available enabling generalizations about the academic performance of those who do complete programs. One major Illinois teacher education institution has compared the academic performance of teacher education majors with non-education majors in the same fields, e.g., mathematics. This comparison reveals that education graduates compare favorably or perform better than non-education graduates in the same courses; overall, teacher education graduates also had higher ACT scores than other graduates when entering as freshmen. These comparisons, however, are limited to students who completed all undergraduate work at the institution and do not, therefore, include transfer students, especially community college transfers who comprise from 20-50% of the graduates of the institution's teacher education programs.[28] Whether the results of this study are similar for all Illinois institutions is unknown.

Evaluating the prior work of transfer students, the bulk of whom are community college graduates, presents a difficult problem for teacher education institutions. Such students usually have not taken the ACT or SAT, and come from a wide range of institutions which may vary considerably in evaluation of student performance. Data reported by four year public institutions to the Board of Higher Education indicate that community college transfers account, depending on the institution, for 16 to 33% of all admissions. Other less formal data support estimates that transfer students comprise, depending on the institution, 10 to 50% of all teacher education candidates.[29] In most institutions, the only admission requirement imposed on such students is demonstrating a "C" average in their previous work.[30]

In addition to assessing academic performance, institutions also assess the capacity of students in practical situations. Data reported by institutions indicate that students are required to acquire both pre-student teaching clinical and student teaching experience, a practice required under present rules and regulations and assured through institutional reviews. Over 80% of all institutions report that assessments of student performance in pre-student teaching clinical experiences are considered before permitting the student to proceed to student teaching. The rigor of these assessments appears to vary widely. Some institutions do little more than require a cooperating teacher to attest to the student's having participated, while others have elaborate systems for identifying apparent deficiencies and providing remediation. Once a student is enrolled in student teaching, the student is likely to achieve an "A"; 75% of all student teachers do; of the remaining 20% receive "B"s. The number of those who receive a failing grade in student teaching appears to have remained at about 1% or less since 1968. Further, 60% of all institutions accept a "D" in student teaching for

graduation purposes; only 10% require a grade above "C" for graduation. The high percentage of "A"s, together with an apparent lack of thorough assessment of performance during pre-student teaching clinical experiences in many cases, suggests that the rigor of assessment of clinical experiences, including student teaching, needs to be increased, particularly assessment of the student's effectiveness as a classroom instructor.[31]

B. Assessment in Graduate Programs

At the graduate level, requirements for admission to programs in areas such as educational administration and school service personnel fields appear to be limited to prior academic performance and scores on standardized aptitude examinations. Although 70% of the programs reporting indicated they require two years of teaching experience prior to enrollment, only 44% reported using recommendations from employers.

This suggests that in over half the cases, the emphasis in admission is exclusively on academic performance with no thorough assessment of potential to practice effectively. The available data indicates that candidates in these programs are expected to demonstrate a 3.0 (A=4.0) grade point average. At the same time, 8% of the respondents indicated that candidates would be recommended for certification even if performance in clinical experience is judged inadequate and only 44% indicate that the overall academic and practical performance of the candidate must be reviewed by the faculty prior to recommendation for certification.[32]

Outcomes of Reactor Panel Deliberations:

The panels examined both undergraduate and graduate programs. The panels concluded that: (1) it is not clear at what points in preparation and on what standards candidates are assessed; (2) professional education offerings need to be more intellectually challenging and up-to-date; (3) practical experience components need to be improved and policies regarding them more rigorously enforced; and (4) faculty in programs need to acquire knowledge and expertise both about current developments in public schools and about supervising candidates.

The panels suggested the following actions:

1. Identifying precise points for quality control in programs such as:

   a. Admission to the college or university.

   b. Entrance into a teacher education program with use of character references, grade point average, and recommendations from professors in student's major and minor fields of concentration.

c. Pre-student teaching clinical experiences with emphasis on appropriate diagnostic and prescriptive procedures.

d. Student teaching with supervision by well-prepared university professors carrying reasonable supervisory loads and qualified cooperating teachers who have the necessary time and expertise.

e. Recommendation for certification which should insure that students meet minimal requirements in basic skills (reading, writing, math reasoning and computation), prove adequacy in major and minor content areas, and demonstrate successfully that they possess teaching skills (rapport with students, classroom management, etc.) through student teaching evaluations.

2. Improving coordination between teacher education institutions and cooperating teachers so that (1) cooperating teachers are properly oriented to their role and responsibilities and are not inundated with unsupervised college students; and (2) frequent supervisory visits by qualified and experienced college faculty to monitor and assist student teachers occur.

3. Requesting districts to assist in identifying candidates with leadership potential in their districts and to work closely with Colleges/Departments of Education in recommending potential students for graduate programs.

4. Reviewing carefully quality control at the following points in graduate programs: (1) admissions; (2) course/field work; (3) at the time of the granting of the degree; and (4) recommendation for certification.

Discussion of Potential Solutions

All of the actions proposed by the reactor panels respon l to identifiable concerns. Implementation of these proposals may, however, significantly alter present policy under which institutions have had wide-ranging discretion to establish standards applied to candidates preparing for educational roles. Yet, in the absence of State-imposed requirements, institutions have not, as a whole, significantly strengthened requirements in the past decade. Some institutions have increased grade point average requirements from 2.0 to 2.5 or even higher, and some have enhanced the rigor of assessment in clinical experiences. Few or none have, however, acted decisively to represent through requirements a demand for excellence in both academic and practical performance. The preponderance of evidence indicates a need for the State to provide leadership in this area, even though doing so may limit institutional discretion and erode institutional autonomy, concepts highly valued by the academic community.

The State could, however, follow actions of other states and avoid intervening in institutional standard-setting by establishing systems for assessing candidates after completing preparation and before awarding certification. Doing so, however, would for all practical purposes limit the State to relying on pencil and paper examinations, the effectiveness of which is likely to be extremely questionable.

A recent study reviewing the issues associated with the use of exams observed that such tests have been used for three purposes: (1) screening candidates for basic skills mastery; (2) assessing knowledge in a teaching specialization; and (3) assessing performance on the job.[33] The use of examinations for any of these purposes raises the following issues:

-- Such examinations may be norm-referenced or criterion-referenced.

   A norm-referenced examination interprets the performance of one person by comparing it to that of others. A criterion-referenced test interprets performance on the examination by comparison to a set of specified behavioral criteria. If the purpose of the test is to distinguish between those who have the stipulated skill or knowledge and those who do not, criterion-referenced tests are preferred.

-- The reliability and validity of the examination would have to be established.

   The complexity of establishing reliability and validity is governed by what the test purports to measure. The task would be considerably easier if content knowledge rather than skill is tested.

-- Levels of proficiency need to be established.

   One author has observed that "there are only subjective ways and no objective ways to establish levels of proficiency." Establishing high standards of proficiency may create shortages; low standards provide little assistance in distinguishing among applicants.

-- The potential impact of such testing programs on minority applicants in Illinois is unknown.

   The impact of testing on minority applicants in other states has been adverse. Under Florida's system there has been a 25% decline overall and a 92% decline among minority students as the result of requiring performance at the 40th percentile on the SAT.

-- Costs associated with criterion-referenced tests may be prohibitive.

An independent firm developed for the South Carolina basic skills tests in three areas of basic skills for $75,000 and field-testing costs are projected at an additional $75,000. In South Carolina, adaptation of eighteen subject-matter tests developed by ETS cost an estimated $60,000. Tests designed to test knowledge in each teaching specialization or to test teaching skills would cost considerably more. For instance, at $30,000 per test, it would cost over one and a half million dollars to develop examinations for each of the fifty or more areas in which Illinois institutions currently prepare candidates.

-- Legal issues associated with testing are significant and complex.

-- Other issues related to testing after preparation is completed and prior to certification have been identified:

- persons selecting test items shape the character of preparation programs;

- tests are likely to eliminate only the more clearly inappropriate candidates but are not likely to clearly distinguish between competent and incompetent applicants;

- the use of tests does not permit holistic assessments of individuals that can be provided by institutions;

- postponing of evaluation until after preparation results in potential use of scarce state resources, through scholarships and subsidy of state institutions, as well as individual resources, to support preparation even when failure to pass any examination can be reliably predicted.

- failure to assess individuals rigorously as early as possible in the preparation program may jeopardize the interests of individuals by delaying their choice of an alternative career.

Indeed, relying on testing after completing preparation but prior to certification has been abondoned by several states in favor of establishing requirements that must be met prior to entry into or during preparation. A staff study of the developments in other states concluded:

> Testing research and practice indicate that it would be more appropriate to establish known standards and test at the beginning of the potential teacher's collegiate program for general skills, and, if necessary, provide remediation at this level. If the student then qualifies to continue in one teacher training program, a specific plan for assessment of teaching skills and content knowledge should follow through to graduation.[34]

The preponderance of evidence supports the panels' recommendation to establish "precise points for quality control in preparation programs" including admission to and during preparation programs. It does not support the use of examinations as a part of the certification process. The evidence also suggests that this recommendation should encompass all preparation programs, not only those leading to teaching certificates.

Staff Recommendations:

The staff recommends that:

1. The State Board of Education commit itself to establishing more rigorous and uniform standards for admission into and retention in all programs--undergraduate and graduate--leading to certification, by June, 1985.

2. The State Board of Education request the State Teacher Certification Board to recommend by January, 1985, specific policies that address assessment of both content knowledge and practical performance as well as admission and retention standards in all programs leading to certification.

3. The State Board of Education request the State Teacher Certification Board to propose a program for annually assessing the quality of the cadre of candidates recommended for certification by Illinois institutions.

ASSESSMENT OF PERSONNEL BY LOCAL DISTRICTS

I. Recruiting and Hiring

Statement of Problem

In Illinois, 58 institutions of higher education prepare personnel for over a thousand districts. These districts differ extensively, not only in size but in the characteristics of students, curriculum, deployment of staff, and expectations regarding public schools and certificated personnel. This diversity among districts makes it impossible for institutions or the State to assure that any certificated individual will fulfill the local district's expectations associated with a specific role. Illinois districts have been hiring about 6,500 teachers each year; 62% are returning, experienced personnel, and the others newly prepared and inexperienced.[35]

Districts rely on two major sources for identifying candidates for positions: unsolicited applications and contacts with preparatory institutions. Current practices may have their source in the seventies when there was a significant over-supply of personnel and no special efforts were needed to create a pool of candidates. There does not appear to be widespread and systematic use of information about available experienced teachers dismissed as a result of reduction in force nor specific efforts to recruit minority candidates. Only about half of the districts have developed a written policy regarding the selection of new professional staff and less than a third report having developed position descriptions. These facts suggest an absence of both formal policies and systematic efforts in recruiting personnel in a majority of districts.

In selecting personnel, districts do appear to use formal standards for employment developed by the district. Only about a third of the districts report imposing academic qualifications exceeding those established in Document I or other state rules and regulations. Less than 5% of the districts use any qualifying tests. Assessment of inexperienced applicants in over half the districts involves review of (1) references from professors and student teaching supervisors; (2) academic records; (3) willingness to accept extra curricular assignments; and (4) qualifications to hold positions other than the one being filled as the most important considerations in selecting inexperienced candidates. In the case of experienced candidates, experience in teaching and references from school administrators assume more importance. Almost 70% of the districts report they always or frequently select applicants qualified to teach in more than one area over those prepared to teach in a single area or at a single level.[36]

The problem in this area can be summarized as follows: a high percentage of Illinois districts have not developed and implemented systematic procedures for recruiting personnel, have not developed formal policies governing selection of candidates, and in general do not undertake independent assessments of the applicant's knowledge. This information also indicates that factors beside fitness for a specific role weigh considerably in selection, particularly willingness to accept extra curricular assignments and qualification to hold positions other than the one in question.

Outcomes of Reactor Panel Deliberations:

The panels identified several constraints preventing more effective recruiting and hiring of personnel: (a) failure of many local districts to develop accurate descriptions of professional positions; (b) absence of a commonly accepted code of ethics to govern recruiting and hiring; (c) absence of written policies concerning these areas at the local level; and (d) lack of coordination in recruiting and hiring.

The panels proposed these actions:

1. Requiring districts to conform to state-level expectations in recruiting and hiring practices by requiring districts to (a) develop and follow written policies concerning recruiting and hiring, including provisions for equal opportunity employment; and (b) develop accurate descriptions for each professional position, including the curricular and extra-curricular responsibilities associated with the position;

2. Studying the reasons why those already certificated do not seek school positions and providing them with current information about the benefits of school employment and a support system for re-entering the system;

3. Establishing a systematic means, probably computer-based and state-administered, of identifying available positions, accurately described, and potential applicants;

4. Encouraging prospective personnel to meet qualifications in two or more areas;

5. Establishing a state-wide task force to study problems associated with staffing co-curricular programs.

Discussion of Potential Solutions

At present, there are no state policies governing the recruitment by local districts of educational personnel. The only formal effort in this area consists of lists, maintained by the State Board of Education, of vacancies voluntarily furnished by districts and of persons seeking positions. This list is published and distributed monthly. For the most part, recruitment is an informal process, depending on contacts among school administrators and between administrators and preparation institutions. There are only a few existing State policies governing a district's selection of personnel. Those policies prohibit discrimination because of sex, race, religion or national origin; local school boards may hire only after the recommendation of the district superintendent; and persons hired must be certificated and qualified for the position to which they are assigned.[37] There are no policies requiring districts to develop formal policies addressing the recruiting and selection of personnel nor formal policies under which the qualifications for each position are stated. Available information suggests that local districts have not, on their own initiative, developed such policies.

Several of the actions proposed by the reactor panels would require establishing State policies under which districts would be required to create and maintain more formal policies and practices in recruiting and selecting personnel. While good management practices would suggest that districts do this, there is little evidence that the results of district recruitment and selection would be improved under such policies. Further imposing requirements regarding recruitment and selection of personnel beyond those already existing would erode local autonomy.

There are, however, areas of concern which the State Board of Education might effectively address through clear and forceful statement of its expectations. The proposed definition of schooling currently being considered by the State Board of Education focuses on academic instruction and its policy regarding student assessment is congruent with the proposed definition of schooling. These two policies suggest that the recruitment and hiring of all teaching, school service and administrative personnel should, therefore, center on the capacity of prospective personnel to discharge the instruction or instruction-related tasks associated with the position in question. The available evidence indicates that districts may need to explore establishing more systematic ways of assessing the potential of candidates to serve district defined needs and goals. Doing so may include creating job-related requirements exceeding state minimum requirements and perhaps examining the knowledge of candidates. Further, the heterogenous cultural, ethnic, and racial composition of Illinois, its communities, and its school-aged children compels strenuous efforts to recruit minority teaching personnel and minority and female administrators in all Illinois school districts.

Staff Recommendations

The staff recommends that:

1. The State Board of Education provide assistance and guidelines to districts in establishing qualifications for positions directly and manifestly related to the instructional components of positions.

2. The State Board of Education request the Illinois Association of School Boards, the Illinois Association of School Administrators and other associations and organizations to cooperate with the State Board of Education in developing ways to assist districts in actively recruiting minority teachers and minority and female administrators.

3. The State Board of Education establish a state-wide committee to study the problems associated with staffing and supervising extra curricular activities and offer recommendations in this area.

4. The State Board of Education elaborate the current placement service it operates so that it more systematically compiles and disseminates information concerning laid-off teachers and available positions in districts.

5. The State Board of Education assist districts in developing procedures for assessing prospective personnel, including the use of interview instruments, job-related examinations, and assessment of references and other records concerning individuals.

II. Assessment of Performance

Statement of Problem

Available information does not permit conclusions about the rigor of the evaluation of educational personnel nor the specific standards currently used in such evaluations. Data reported by a sample of districts indicate that:[38]

1. Over 25% of the districts do not report using standardized instruments in evaluating teachers; over 20% have not developed specific written criteria to be used in evaluation of teachers. Less than 50% of the districts use standardized instruments to evaluate non-instructional staff, and less than 60% have developed specific written criteria for evaluating these groups of personnel.

2. When written criteria are used to evaluate teachers, over 40% of the districts indicated that primary responsibility for their development occurs through consultation between evaluator and evaluatee. The next frequent source of such criteria is administrative committees.

3. Districts indicated the following about the criteria used for evaluation:

   a. Teachers: Four areas of evaluation were cited most by over 75% of the districts: professional competence, professional attitude, relations with peers, and relations with parents. About 60% of the districts report using student achievement as a criterion in evaluation.

   b. Administrators: The categories cited most frequently in evaluation of administrators are: professional competence, professional attitude, and relationship with parents and peers. Less than 30% of the districts reported using student achievement as a category.

c. School Service Personnel: In this area, as with teachers and administrators, relationships with peers and parents, professional attitude and competence were cited most frequently. Less than 20% of the districts reported using student achievement as a category.

The effect of evaluation of professional educators is difficult to assess. However, between 80% and 90% of all districts indicate that a written plan for remediation is developed if performance is judged unsatisfactory. A high percentage of districts also report that such evaluations are followed by more frequent evaluations and supervisory conferences. About 10% of the districts reported dismissing teachers on contractual continued service because of unsatisfactory performance and slightly less than 30% of the districts estimate that at least one such teacher voluntarily left the district because of unsatisfactory performance. About 40% of the districts report dismissing probationary teachers and probationary teachers leaving voluntarily because of unsatisfactory performance. Generalized to all districts, the available data suggest that about 80 contractual continued service teachers per year are dismissed because of unsatisfactory performance and about 250 leave voluntarily for the same reason. Among probationary teachers, the data suggest the numbers are considerably higher: about 530 per year are dismissed and 360 leave voluntarily. In any one year, these data suggest, slightly more than 1% of the teaching force leaves either involuntarily or voluntarily because of unsatisfactory performance. Only 17% of the districts report granting a third year of probationary status as allowed by statute although 70% of the districts report hiring new teachers.[39]

About 10% or less of all districts report dismissing administrators or school service personnel or individuals in these areas or individuals leaving because of unsatisfactory performance.

These data, it should be noted, do not permit generalization about the adequacy of evaluation of professional staffs nor about the retention of personnel who may be performing at an inadequate level. They do provide the basis for estimating that approximately 9% of the teachers hired are dismissed within two years because of unsatisfactory performance.

When, as part of a survey of Illinois districts, districts were asked to identify the constraints encountered in the evaluation of staff, about one-third cited one or more constraints in this area. In descending order of frequency, those identified were: (1) lack of time to carry out evaluation; (2) statutes regulating dismissal of tenured staff; (3) failure to achieve mutual understanding between administrators and teachers regarding the purpose of evaluation; (4) lack of expertise; (5) restrictions on evaluation in negotiated contracts; and (6) intervention of school board members and community pressure.

Information about the evaluation of the performance of educational personnel does not permit conclusions about its effectiveness. The available data indicate that most districts have developed formal procedures for evaluating teachers, but that less than half have done so for evaluating other personnel. The information reported by districts also indicates that current evaluation practices do result in either dismissal of or resignation by some personnel. Yet, districts do not appear to evaluate carefully and extensively the performance of probationary personnel, and, when warranted, extend the probationary period as permitted by law. There is virtually no information concerning the effectiveness of evaluation as a means for improving individual performance. The major constraints preventing the development of more effective evaluation practices appear to be (1) lack of time to conduct evaluations and (2) the expertise necessary to evaluate and support improvements in personnel.

Outcomes of Reactor Panel Deliberations

The panels identified as issues needing attention: (1) the lack of formal procedures for evaluating the performance of school personnel; (2) the lack of resources and expertise to carry out effective evaluation; and (3) shortness of the present probationary period.

The panels suggested the following actions:

(1) Developing criteria for evaluation based on "job specific" research which discriminates between satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance;

(2) Requiring annual evaluation of all professional personnel based on multiple criteria, including student achievement;

(3) Distinguishing between the process of evaluating for purposes of retaining or dismissing and evaluating to assist in improvement;

(4) Using the outcomes of evaluation as a means of recognizing important contributions;

(5) Developing a system to assist districts in assembling the resources and expertise necessary to carry out effective evaluation programs;

(6) Extending the length of the present probationary period.

Discussion of Potential Solutions:

Several states have established policies establishing criteria and procedures under which local districts are required to evaluate educational personnel. One of the earliest states to do so was California, with the enactment in 1971 of legislation known as the Stull Act. This Act has the following features:

1) Each district must adopt a uniform set of written objective evaluation guidelines for use in evaluating the professional competency of its certificated staff.

2) These guidelines must include (1) standards of expected student progress in each area of study and techniques for assessing that progress; (2) assessment of certificated personnel competence as related to these standards; (3) assessment of performance of personnel in carrying out duties normally required but in addition to their regular assignments; and (4) establishment of procedures and techniques for determining whether personnel maintain proper control and preserve a suitable learning environment.

Under this system each employee must be evaluated annually and "follow-up counseling" is required when professional competency is judged deficient.

The State of California believes this program of evaluation assists in progress toward the following goals:

1) commending individuals with outstanding competence and performance;

2) identifying conditions handicapping effectiveness of individual's effort to be effective;

3) identifying and remediating identified weakness in performance; and

4) reassigning or terminating those who perform unsatisfactorily.[40]

So far as can be determined, the effectiveness of this legislation has not been formally evaluated. Contact California with state officials revealed that the principal effect of the legislation was to focus attention on the issue of developing district plans and staff evaluation. These officials indicate it has virtually been ignored for the past five years primarily for two reasons: (1) the amount of paperwork required was burdensome; and (2) the relationship between student outcomes and teacher performance was difficult, if not impossible, to establish and use credibly in evaluation. Other states, Mississippi being the latest, have, however, recently implemented

such legislation. The absence of any significant evaluations of the effects of California's Stull Act or similar programs elsewhere provides little basis for urging that Illinois pursue a similar course. Moreover, none of these legislative approaches appear to have addressed the question of evaluating other educational personnel.

Although State requirements or legislative mandates concerning evaluation of professional staff appear likely to prove ineffective and impractical, there are, as the panels point out, several areas of concern. They are as follows:

1) Focusing evaluation on success in meeting instructional goals rather than subjective impressions about "good teaching";

2) Differentiating between evaluation undertaken to determine dismissal or retention and evaluation designed to assist in improvement;

3) Strengthening the capacity of principals and other supervisors in evaluating teachers and other staff;

4) Lengthening the current probationary period for newly employed personnel.

Donald Medley concludes a review of the problems in evaluating the performance and competence of teachers as follows:

> The contribution a teacher makes to the effectiveness of a school program depends on many factors, among which there are only two that are under the teachers control and for which the teacher is accountable: the teacher's competency and the teacher's motivation or drive.
>
> ... ...
>
> Both how well a teacher performs and how effective the teacher is depend on situational or contextual factors as well as on teacher competence and motivation, and are therefore more the concern of the school system and the community that employs the teacher, more under their control, than under the control of the profession.[41]

In arriving at these conclusions, Medley reviews research concerning problems in assessing teacher competence and performance, including efforts to relate the effectiveness of teachers to pupil learning. He concludes that basing measurements of teacher effectiveness on pupil learning has "neither enough reliability or validity." He also points out that he knows of "no religious faith whose believers have more confidence in it than educators have in this extraordinary notion that they can recognize

competent teaching when they see it, a delusion shared by every lay person with equal conviction." Medley's strong attack on this notion has its source in the absence of evidence showing that teachers rated high on assessment instruments used by supervisors "are the least bit more effective than teachers rated low." He reports that the few studies conducted on the reliability of supervisory rates "are unanimous in indicating that as predictors of teacher effectiveness, supervisory ratings have no validity whatsoever."

If Medley is correct, -- and he may not be -- it would appear that the assessment of teacher performance, as well as that of other professional educators indirectly influencing student learning, cannot legitimately be based squarely on outcomes of student learning nor on supervisory ratings. A more valid approach to evaluation of educational personnel has to abandon the notion that specific levels of performance guarantee specific levels of outcomes and to focus more directly on whether choices and responses teachers make in every day teaching situations are appropriate and based on the best knowledge available. To demand more would be similar to demanding lawyers to guarantee winning every case.

But to effect evaluation even of the more limited sort urged above requires at least two elements: (1) supervisors knowledgeable about what is known and skilled in assessing the appropriateness of an individual teachers' choices; and (2) more than episodic observations and evaluation. Achievement of the first may require extensive training of personnel, and the second, allocating more of the scarce time of principals and supervisors to this activity.

Further, a program for evaluating personnel may need to distinguish between (1) evaluation for purposes of determining adequacy of the teacher's competence and of deciding whether to dismiss or retain a teacher; and (2) evaluation designed to assist personnel in improving. Medley points out that teachers frequently find it advantageous to "impress everyone favorably, to make every one think one is competent" and "to look competent rather than learning to be competent." Sarasson elaborates on this point when he says that the teacher generally, and the beginning teacher in particular:

> tends to anticipate failure, is plagued by all kinds of doubts, fearful of a negative evaluation, thankful for her relative isolation, due to fleeting and infrequent visitations by administrative superiors, and yet acutely aware that she needs and wants help, guidance, and support uncomplicated by the implied threat of a negative evaluation.[42]

These observations about the co-mingling of evaluation designed to secure improvement and that designed to make retention decisions may be generalizable to other categories of personnel as well.

The issue of the appropriate length of the probationary period for newly hired teachers is frequently raised. The most criticized provision limits dismissal without cause to two years, or less than two years since notification usually must be provided by April. Yet the The School Code of Illinois provides that, in the case of individuals without experience prior to being hired by the district, the probationary period may be extended for an additional year upon notification to the teacher of the reasons for doing so.[43] In a recent survey only about 17% of the districts reported doing so. Until this option is exercised more consistently by districts there appears to be no evidence supporting the need for extending the probationary period.

Improving either the reliability or effectiveness of the evaluation of individual practitioners is not likely to be enhanced by additional State requirements. Such requirements simply cannot be responsive to the unique and idiosyncratic character of each and every case. There are already the following requirements in existence:

(1) The principal is required by statute to submit recommendations to the superintendent concerning the appointment, retention, promotion and assignment of all personnel assigned to the attendance center;[44]

(2) Document I requires that every district conduct supervisory and inservice programs for its professional staff.

In addition, evaluation of teachers is frequently included in collective bargaining agreements. In 1981-82, districts with such agreements employed 85% of the teachers employed in the State. Slightly over 60% of these agreements contained provisions concerning the evaluation of employees. The incidence of these provisions increases as the size of the districts increases as the following table illustrates.

Percentage of Districts with Collectively Bargained Agreements Including Provisions Concerning Employee Evaluation[45]

Size of District	Type of District		
	% Elementary	% High School	% Unit
0-499	61	50	54
500-999	60	77	35
1000-2999	66	66	48
3000-5,999	90	65	61
6,000-11,999	100	100	86
over 12,000	100	100	80

In addition to any state requirements, provisions concerning evaluation in negotiated contracts are applicable to over half of the state's teachers.

The problem in the area of evaluation appears to be not the absence of legal mechanisms to govern evaluation but the absence of time, commitment, and expertise to accomplish it in a satisfactory way. Instead of establishing elaborate policy in this area, the preferred alternative is to assist those charged with responsibility to evaluate to discharge this duty more effectively. Such a direction is consistent with and supported by recommendations concerning the principalship previously submitted to the State Board of Education, particularly the recommendation designed to assist principals in providing instructional leadership.

Staff Recommendations

The staff recommends that:

1. The State Board of Education revise the current rule in Document I related to supervision and inservice education so that it specifically requires each school district to follow a written plan for evaluating professional certificated staff which (1) assures that each certificated staff member will receive at least one written evaluation annually, incorporating advice regarding how performance may be improved; and (2) stipulates that probationary personnel receive such evaluations four times annually.

2. The State Board of Education establish a state-sponsored program designed to assist principals and other supervisory personnel in developing skills and knowledge necessary to evaluate personnel effectively that is administered through an Academy for the Development of Administrators and Supervisors.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Statement of Problem

The continued development of educational personnel, particularly teachers, has increasingly become the center of discussions concerning the improvement of performance. In the past, it was possible to assume that the relatively high percentage of newly prepared personnel infused new approaches and ideas into the public school system. In 1964-65, for instance, the turnover rate among downstate teachers was estimated at 15%; in 1980-81, this rate had dipped to about 8%. Moreover, districts have increasingly hired experienced rather than newly prepared teachers to fill vacancies. In 1974-75, about 60% of all teachers hired were newly prepared; in 1981-82, this percentage had fallen to about 36%. Relying on the infusion of newly prepared personnel will have little effect on assuring that the teaching force is aware of and using the latest knowledge and teaching strategies.[46]

State Board of Education Document 1 requires that "every school system shall conduct supervisory and inservice training for its professional staff. The staff shall be involved in planning, conducting, and evaluating the inservice program." The School Code of Illinois places major responsibility for professional development on Regional Superintendents to "arrange for or conduct district, regional, or county institutes, or equivalent professional educational experiences not more than four days annually" and to use fees from registration and renewal of certificates "to defray administrative expenses incidental to teachers' institutes, workshops or meetings of a professional nature." The statutes also provide support to local districts in conducting professional development programs by allowing districts to use five half-days of the required 176 student-attendance days for such efforts. These statutory provisions, then, allow for a total of 6 1/2 days annually for professional development activities.[47]

In a previous report to the State Board of Education's Planning and Policy Committee, the staff concluded that available information indicates that these days tend to be used for two kinds of purposes: (1) parent-teacher conferences, grade-reporting, workshops on curriculum development, and a variety of other activities; and (2) "general motivation speeches or meetings, seminars or workshops on a particular topic of current concern of a day's duration or less." The staff noted that "in-depth training sessions lasting over a period of time are generally not a part of the structure of existing professional development activities." The staff observed, in addition, that "coordination of inservice training planning or implementation related to state or regional goals or problems is not facilitated by the present system."

A survey of a sample of districts requested districts to describe their programs in the area of professional development. A summary of these responses indicate that "the mechanisms for inservice education identified most frequently are district, county, and regional workshops" and that "many districts provide reimbursement for college and university coursework." These responses did include descriptions of the activities of a few districts which were more continuous and comprehensive and the use of Teacher Centers and the Illinois Centers for Educational Improvement.[48]

The major sources of funds for inservice education include (1) fees collected by Regional Superintendents for registering and renewing certificates (conservatively estimated at over $400,000 annually); and (2) federal categorical programs (e.g., Compensatory Education, Chapter II, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, and Vocational Education Act), with the total from these and other State and federal sources estimated in 1981 at over $25 million annually. Federal statutes and rules and regulations, however, severely restrict the purposes for which federal categorical monies can be used. Only the funds collected by Regional Superintendents are unrestricted.[49]

The staff report to the Planning and Policy Committee referred to above notes that there is "currently no agency definition of inservice education" and that "there is a need to define inservice education as it relates to the role of the State Board of Education." The reactor panels reached similar conclusions, noting that while there are various terms used to refer to professional development, "a definition of what the process should entail along with establishment of limits as to what this money and time could reasonably and profitably be used for are issues which must be resolved by the Illinois State Board of Education."

Outcomes of Reactor Panel Deliberations

In the area of staff development, the panels identified the following problems: (1) staff development in Illinois is fragmented, uncoordinated, and inadequately funded; (2) staff development is not carried out in consistent fashion across the state; (3) there is no clear relationship between staff development and certification renewal; and (4) staff development needs to be designed to serve a variety of professional and district needs.

The reactor panels suggested the following actions:

(1) Developing state guidelines regarding what constitutes adequate staff development and requiring districts to prepare five-year staff development plans to be reviewed and approved by the Illinois State Board of Education;

(2) Urging the federal government to consolidate categorical funds and to relax regulations to permit effective use of federal money for staff development;

(3) Reallocating higher education and regional superintendent fiscal resources to support staff development;

(4) Developing staff development programming to focus on the specific needs of groups of personnel, e.g., those who are beginning, those preparing for expanded or new assignments, those who need to remediate;

(5) Requiring evidence of professional growth as a condition for renewing certificates;

(6) Developing models for delivery of staff development at the regional and state levels assuring sustained collaboration among local districts, regional service units, institutions of higher education and other providers of staff development support.

Discussion of Potential Solutions

The terms used to refer to programs designed to enhance the capacity and performance of personnel,--inservice, staff development, professional development and so on--frequently encompass a number of goals. As a result, discussion of such programs tends to become amorphous and unfocused. In general, the elements of these programs include response to four situations:

1) orienting and assisting personnel who are inexperienced or new to a district;

2) providing those performing satisfactorily with programs to continue to improve in terms of district goals;

3) assisting those whose performance is inadequate to improve; and

4) developing programs for those preparing for new or expanded assignments.

These four major kinds of staff development represent two distinct types of activities: (1) organizationally oriented staff development which seeks to incorporate new personnel successfully into the district's efforts and seeks to improve personnel in terms of district goals and aspirations; and (2) individually oriented staff development in which the focus is on unique and highly individual inadequacies in performance or on preparation for new or expanded assignments which depends on individual motivation and response to existing incentives.

Of these two kinds of staff development, only the organizationally oriented type can be successfully and meaningfully addressed by state policy. While the other type--individualized--is very important, the uniqueness of virtually every situation prevents the development of meaningful policy. In addition, remedial staff development ought logically be directly related to the evaluation of individuals. Preparation for new or expanded roles under present policies of the State Board of Education is virtually limited to further study at colleges and universities in order to qualify for new teaching fields in accordance with Document 1 staff qualifications or to acquire advanced degrees for school service personnel or administrative certificates.

A. Organizational Staff Development

As noted earlier in this section, discussions of staff development in schools frequently encompass several kinds of activities and a variety of goals, including efforts to improve the performance of individuals and to improve the performance of entire staffs in a district. There is a need to distinguish between the continued improvement of an individual's performance and pursuit of career goals and the improvement of the human resources in a district to enable realization of district goals. Organizational, or district-defined, staff development responds to the needs of a district, while individual staff development focuses on the unique and personal concerns of an individual staff member, whether it be learning a new technique or acquiring qualifications for another position. Organizational staff development examines and responds to the capacity of an entire staff in areas of vital importance. It is a "process that embraces the entire cycle of human resource management within a school system," and it is aimed at "problem-solving" rather than motivating or credentialing individuals.

Currently all Illinois school districts are required to sponsor inservice education programs, and Regional Superintendents are permitted to sponsor various kinds of professional education activities. In addition, some federal funds are used to sponsor programs for professional development. As noted earlier, however, available information indicates that the present delivery system for staff development consists largely of workshops or training sessions severely limited in time and largely geared to creating awareness and not the development and application of knowledge and skill.

The improvement of public schooling in Illinois requires creation of a state-wide program to support district-level development efforts, efforts that (1) are responsive to the instructional needs and goals of districts; (2) are sufficiently funded; and (3) command the respect and support of the educational profession as well as the community. The need for such programs has several dimensions including the continuing knowledge explosion as it affects both curricular content and teaching strategies, the need for districts to maintain and enhance the human resources necessary to attain their goals and aspirations, and developing the capacity of districts to flexibly deploy staff and modify curriculum in the face of declining, or at least, changing enrollment patterns. These needs require a program at the state level that will result in staff development that commands the respect of the education profession and Illinois communities and which is coherent and focused on local district needs.

The State Board of Education has emphasized the importance of the instructional program throughout its recently commissioned review of all State educational mandates. As part of this study, the Board is considering a definition of schooling: "a formal process which has as its primary purpose the systematic transmission of knowledge and culture, whereby children learn in areas fundamental to their continuing development." Implicit in this definition is the assumption that knowledge is not static and that instructional programs and educational personnel must change to meet or anticipate new knowledge and other changes.

District-defined, or organizational, staff development is a vehicle well-designed to foster outcomes consistent with educational renewal. Organizational staff development provides a vehicle for school or district-wide personnel to:

1. Review and develop district missions and instructional outcomes and develop appropriate specificity for them;

2. Reexamine roles of instructional personnel and identify knowledges, attitudes, and skills that will increase their effectiveness and enhance their jobs;

3. Stay abreast of emerging knowledge and societal change;

4. Engage in joint deliberation about possible solutions to district-wide problems;

5. Create collegiality and document successes and good practice so that a district may profit from its experience; and

6. Develop ownership and incentives in matters of common concern.

These outcomes are viewed as essential to the ongoing improvement of instruction. It is assumed that additional education for teachers and increased collegiality will result in more efficient and pertinent instruction and will, in turn, create the conditions for potential increases in student achievement.

In recent years, as comprehensive approaches to professional development have been formulated, school districts and professional educators have not developed much evidence about the impact of these programs on instructional improvement and pupil achievement. The emphasis has been more on the process than on the product. Thus, available research does not demonstrate that organizational programs are superior to other delivery systems. Scholars such as Bruce Joyce and Daniel Stufflebeam, however, are in the process of validating standards, criteria and techniques for effective professional development, such as on-site coaching for new teaching techniques. James Popham believes that refined testing techniques (including criterion-referenced measures) can link teacher knowledge and behavior with pupil progress.[50]

Although research has not clearly established the efficacy of organizational staff development, particularly its effect on student achievement, the experience of schools and educators has demonstrated its positive impact on teacher behavior and school climate. Through anecdotal evidence and observation techniques, researchers are able to document changes in teacher behaviors and use of various materials. Increased collegiality and

alteration in communication patterns among school staff can also be charted. Investigations of school-focused staff development (Kenneth Howey and others) suggest that school improvement efforts will not be effective in the absence of certain conditions. Among them are: teacher participation and sense of ownership, incentives, linking of professional development activities to instructional goals, leadership of the principal, and directed practice and reflection upon new techniques. These relationships are not easy to quantify; perhaps these conditions are necessary but not always sufficient for school improvement. In Illinois, some school districts have implemented district-defined staff development and report positive results.

Many of the shortcomings of current staff development programs can be traced to a lack of comprehensive planning and systematic use of available knowledge and assistance. An organizational approach to staff development requires careful assessment of district needs followed by design and implementation of programs responsive to these needs. Without stronger state leadership and support and without state requirements in this area, significant change does not appear likely. Present efforts are constrained by lack of definitions and guidelines, models for organizing it, methods for identifying or developing instructional components, and suggestions for documenting and evaluating staff development. At the same time, the State Board of Education has assembled a wealth of resources and expertise through its involvement in staff development over the past decade or longer while administering federal funds of which a high proportion have focused on staff development (Title I, Educational Innovation); developing and testing the Illinois School Problems Index; creating and implementing the Illinois Centers for Educational Improvement; working directly with school districts through the Program Service Teams; making available the Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network; and coordinating Teacher Center activities.

The development of guidelines and requirements at the State-level would provide definition, direction, and coherence to several efforts already underway and would likely result in improved capacity of districts to realize their goals. These results are likely to be realized, however, only if state-level actions avoid the creation of mere bureaucratic exercises and requiring districts to do what they cannot fund.

The continued development of administrators and supervisor presents specific problems. As noted earlier, there is a need particularly to improve expertise in the area of personnel evaluation. At the same time, the limited numbers of administrators and supervisors in a high percentage of districts and the highly specialized resources needed to support their development indicate the need for a program designed specifically for this category of personnel. This program might take the form of a state-level academy for the development of administrators and supervisors coordinated and sponsored by the State Board of Education, which could undertake as one of its major purposes improving expertise in the area of personnel evaluation.

B. Beginning and Returning Personnel

In Illinois, school districts have not, as a group, developed comprehensive, ongoing staff development programs. As a result, there is not only an absence of general support for development of staff, but a lack of assistance for inexperienced personnel, for personnel new to a district or moving from one kind of role to another within a district, e.g., teaching to supervision. Available evidence indicates that inexperienced personnel or those moving into new roles need specific kinds of support in order to become effective as soon as possible.

The literature has frequently identified the first year of teaching as a critical period in the career of the teacher. One study of beginning elementary teachers in Illinois found that respondents had difficulty in "providing for different student learning styles" and "working in a mainstreamed situation" and with the roles of the teacher as a "link to the community" and "the teacher as planner." Beginning physical education teachers, on the other hand, had the greatest amount of difficulty in managing classes with large number of students, serving as a link to the community, and adapting instruction to available facilities.[51] The transition from student to professional requires not only the application of generic skills and theory to a particular context, but doing so while adapting to the policies and practices of a specific district and school and to the expectations of a specific community. At present, beginning teachers effect this transition without systematic support. The returning experienced teacher appears to experience the same kinds of difficulty, although there is virtually no research in this area. Reentering the profession after a lapse of one to several years, perhaps in a different district and school, necessitates not only reorientation, but assistance in sharpening skills and updating knowledge.

In the case of Illinois administrators, available data show that there is about a five-year interval between completion of preparation programs and assumption of the role for which they prepared.[52] Not only does this lengthy interval mean that important aspects of the roles may have changed significantly but administrators consistently report that regardless of the quality of their preparation, they achieve mastery of their position on-the-job. No one preparation program can undertake to prepare principals, for instance, to serve effectively for all schools in Illinois. In some instances, principals in Illinois are responsible for schools that are larger than some districts, while in other instances the principal serves as part-time principal, part-time teacher. The same variation in other administrative roles is observable.

School service personnel experience the same kind of difficulty at the beginning stage. In part, this difficulty has its source in the wide variations among districts in the ways in which they utilize these personnel. But perhaps the most difficulty is experienced in serving in a consultative role with teachers, parents, administrators and other school service personnel and serving as a link to other community agencies.

The available information indicates that there is clearly a need for systematic support not only for beginning teachers, but for experienced, returning teachers, beginning administrators and school service personnel as well as any professional new to a district.

Other states--Oklahoma, Florida and Georgia--have implemented programs designed to support beginning teachers. These programs have been designed not only to provide support but to conclude with a recommendation for granting or denying continuing certification. In Florida, various competencies were identified, and an evaluation system to assess performance in these and other areas was developed. The system developed is being implemented on a state-wide basis. The beginning teacher is supported by a team comprised of an administrator, a peer teacher, and a district or university representative. This team supervises beginning teachers carefully and closely. The supervsion is designed to accomplish two purposes: (1) improving performance and (2) recommending granting or denial of a continuing certificate. The Florida model has a number of deficiencies, however: (1) it is applicable only to beginning and inexperienced teachers, and does not apply to returning personnel, those new to districts or to administrators and school service personnel; (2) it results not in decisions about continued employment, but continued certification; and (3) it has a state-wide focus and is not responsive to the unique needs of individual professionals or to the specific district, school, and role in which the individual performs. Finally, it should be noted that no state has operated such a program for any significant period of time and has not evaluated the effectiveness of such a program.[53]

While available models have observable deficiencies, they suggest that it is possible to address systematically the need of providing support and assistance to professionals beginning or re-entering one or another certificated role. Applied to Illinois, such a program should encompass the following: (1) all categories of certified personnel; (2) individuals entering or re-entering a role for which certification is required; and (3) personnel new to a district.

C. Renewal of Certificates:

The reactor panels suggested establishing a system similar to that in several other states for renewing certificates based on evidence of continued professional development.

In Illinois at present, the validity of a certificate is maintained by annually registering the certificate with a Regional Superintendent; certificates are automatically renewable every four years upon payment of required fees, which are designated for support of professional development. Provisions of existing statutes requiring "evidence of professional growth" prior to registration have not been enforced and no regulations have been issued to implement them. These provisions allow a wide range of activities as evidencing professional growth; including successful teaching experience, membership in professional organizations, travel and reading of books and journals. This range of possible avenues for professional development is so extensive that it virtually defies meaningful enforcement.[54]

These statutory provisions were enacted into law in 1951. At that time, a high percentage of teachers had not attained a bachelor's degree, and continued professional development therefore consisted mainly of continuing work toward a degree. The purpose of these provisions was, in short, realized through a system that virtually required continued college-level study. In 1964-65, at the time when a bachelors degree was required of all teachers, the State of Illinois faced a teacher shortage. As a consequence, these provisions have not been implemented.

At the same time, virtually all Illinois districts reward graduate study, at least for teachers, through advancement on the salary schedule. The effect of this provision results in a differential of 8-9% between beginning salaries for beginning teachers with bachelors and masters degrees and an approximate differential of 14% for maximum scheduled salaries for holders of these degrees. In addition, 47% of all districts with collectively bargained agreements provide partial or total tuition reimbursement. The effect of these policies has resulted in roughly 40% of all teachers holding masters or higher degrees as of 1981-82. If the number of teachers with two years or less of experience are subtracted in calculating this percentage, it increases to approximately 45%. Moreover, 57% of all collectively bargained agreements contain provisions related to professional growth; 23% of these provisions require evidence of such growth. Requirements for renewal of certificates limited to further academic studies are likely, therefore, to be of little value for a significant percentage of currently employed teachers.[55]

The central issue in considering requiring evidence of professional growth for renewal of certificates focuses on the character of the State's interest to be served by such a requirement and the practical question whether this interest would, in fact, be protected by available administrative methods.

Requiring presentation of evidence of professional development for renewal of certificates rests on one or more of the following assumptions:

1) The State can and must be assured that practitioners maintain the knowledge and skills necessary to carry out the duties for which they are responsible. This assumption is based on the premise that an elementary teacher prepared twenty years ago may not have developed knowledge of the metric system; the mathematics teacher may know little about computers; the English teacher may not be acquainted with developments in linguistics; and that supervisors, administrators and school service personnel may have little or no knowledge of significant developments in learning theory, advances in teaching exceptional children, or other areas ranging from testing to school law.

2) The State can make a judgment of the preparedness of an individual to continue discharging the role for which they are certificated that is more valid and reliable than the judgment of the local district that the individual is performing at least adequately.

3) The evidence that the State requires for certificate renewal will predict improved performance.

4) Through renewing certificates, a more reliable judgment can be made than at the time of initial certification.

Renewal of certificates, if based solely on judgments made at the State level, is an inappropriate mechanism as a means for seeking to improve, or assure adequate, performance. The State simply cannot require the presentation of the kinds of evidence and make the kinds of judgments required to fulfill such a goal. Both assessment of performance and providing support for continuing development of personnel are appropriately the responsibility of local districts. The State, therefore, can protect its interest in assuring that practitioners possess necessary skills and knowledge by requiring that teaching and school service personnel successfully complete district-defined staff development programs and that supervisory and administrative personnel successfully complete programs sponsored by the Academy for the Development of Administrators and Supervisors.

This approach to renewal of certificates has several advantages:

(1) It recognizes that the State cannot determine what is appropriate staff development content;

(2) It protects the State interest in assuring that school personnel remain capable and up-to-date;

(3) It recognizes the mutual responsibility of districts and staff members to assure continued development by requiring districts to provide staff development support and establishing the professional responsibility of professional staff to make use of this support.

Staff Recommendations

The staff recommends that:

1. The State Board of Education commit itself to establishing policy regarding organizational staff development that has as its aim increasing district capacity to realize district goals and which encompasses all categories of professional personnel--teachers, school service personnel, and administrators.

2. The State Board of Education create a requirement in Document 1 under which award of recognition requires, in part, a three-year plan for organizational staff development that may be limited to the district or involve the district in consortial efforts.

3. The State Board of Education seek funding for organizational staff development by:

   a) Requesting legislative appropriations for funding of district-wide staff development at the rate of two dollars per student, with such funds allocated to districts on the basis of the number of professional staff members and upon presentation of an approvable plan;

   b) Seeking legislation to increase current certificate registration fees collected by Regional Superintendents from four to twenty dollars annually, with the monies collected at the regional level to be disbursed as follows:

      1) Twenty percent ($4) to be retained by Regional Superintendents and used as provided for by current law;

      2) Ten percent ($2) to be forwarded to the State Board of Education to support the activities of an Academy for the Development of Administrators and Supervisors;

      3) Seventy percent ($14) be allocated to districts within the region on the basis of an approvable plan for staff development and on the basis of the number of professional staff members in the district;

4. The State Board of Education request the cooperation of the Joint Education Committee to determine effective policies under which Illinois public universities would be required and supported to undertake significant and effective involvement in district-wide staff development;

5. The State Board of Education seek legislation under which Illinois districts may count an additional five half-days as official school days when used in connection with an approved staff development plan.

6. The State Board of Education develop and implement a Program for Supporting Beginning and Re-entering Educational Professionals by:

   a) Developing proposed rules and regulations in Document 1 that would require districts to develop and implement individualized programs for each eligible professional.

   b) Seeking appropriations to support such a program at the following levels: $1,000 for each beginning professional and $500 for each re-entering professional.

7. The State Board seek amendments to statutes governing certification renewal to require employed teachers, school service personnel, and administrators to present evidence of successful completion of district staff development programs in order to renew certificates.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Improving the Quality of Teacher Education in Florida: Report and Recommendations of the Joint Legislative and Executive Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement, March, 1983.

[2]Memo dated October 8, 1981, from Alvin Lierheimer, Acting Deputy Commissioner, New York State Department of Education to New York school officials and organizations. This memo and the attached report describe legislative initiatives including establishing undergraduate scholarships and fellowships for prospective teachers as well as plans for further conferences. See also The Need for Quality: A Report to the Southern Regional Education Board by Its Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools, June, 1981.

[3]Study Report No. 4: Assessment Programs and Policies of Other States, Illinois State Board of Education. See also The Need for Quality cited above.

[4]National Science Foundation News Release, April 28, 1982. The background information for this release includes the assertion that in 1981, "50 percent of teachers newly employed nationwide to teach secondary science and mathematics were actually uncertified to teach those subjects."

[5]The California Plan was established by legislation known as the Stull Act. See also Study Report No. 4.

[6]See Study Report No. 4.

[7]The survey referred to was prepared in connection with the Report to the Council of Chief State School Officers by the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Certification, Preparation, and Accreditation.

[8]The Illinois State Board of Education adopted the plan for A Study to Assess the Quality of the Preparation and Performance of Educational Personnel at its meeting in July, 1981.

[9]Reports concerning deficiencies in the preparation and performance of teachers are extremely numerous. One of the latest examples in the media is the cover story for U.S. News and World Report (March 14, 1983), entitled "What's Wrong with Our Teachers."

[10]See Phase I Mandate Studies: Final Staff Recommendations Presented to the Illinois State Board of Education Planning and Policy Committee, January 12, 1983.

[11]The outcomes of the panels' deliberations are summarized in A Study of the Quality of the Preparation and Performance of Educational Personnel: External Reactor Panel Reports, March, 1983.

[12]See The School Code of Illinois, 30-1 and following. Present statutes (30-15.7e) also provide for scholarships for those preparing for bilingual certificates; this provision apparently has not been funded.

[13]The information reported here is a summary of a more extensive discussion in Recruitment and Retention of Teachers: A Paper Prepared for the Joint Education Committee, Illinois State Boards of Education and Higher Education, March 24, 1982, especially pages 7-9. The data from the High School and Beyond Study appear in Appendix III of that paper.

[14]The information reported here is taken from Recruitment and Retention of Teachers, pp. 6-7.

[15]Study Report No. 2: Institutional Assessment of Prospective Educational Personnel in Undergraduate Programs, Illinois State Board of Education, p. 9.

[16]The information reported here appears in Recruitment and Retention of Teachers, pp. 7-9.

[17]Statement of Milton Goldberg, Acting Director, National Institute of Education, Subcomittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., September 10, 1981.

[18]Jane A. Page, Fred M. Page, Jr., and Aubrey W. Shelton, "The Teaching Profession as a Career Opportunity: Perceptions of High School Seniors, Pre-service Teachers, and In-service Teachers," presented at Annual Conference of American Educational Research Association, March 22, 1982.

[19]This estimate is based on a conservative assumption of 100,000 teachers employed in Illinois public school districts in Illinois. In 1982-83, there were 104,162 full-time equivalent classroom teachers plus school service personnel.

[20]The lowering of certification requirements in response to supply and demand can be illustrated with numerous examples. Illinois presently grants provisional and temporary provisional certificates for teaching in vocational programs and at one time issued temporary certificates for teachers of the trainable mentally handicapped and for teachers of foreign language (See The School Code of Illinois, 1969 and 1981, Section 21).

[21]This history of teacher scholarships is based on a review of The School Codes of Illinois for the years 1905-1981 and interviews with selected Illinois State Board of Education employees.

[22]There is no information available for years prior to 1969 enabling determination of the number of scholarships awarded, the number used by recipients, and the number of those who subsequently taught. The estimate that 50% of the recipients between 1969-71 taught for at least two years is based on data developed in connection with procedures for collecting the amount of the scholarships from those who did not teach. The general provisions for these scholarships can be found at 30-1 and following in various School Codes of Illinois.

[23]A more extended discussion of this area is presented in The Recruitment and Retention of Teachers, pp. 10-13.

[24]Data taken from High School and Beyond Study (see Appendix III, "Recruitment and Retention of Teachers") and from the Teacher Service Record. Data concerning race and ethnicity were not collected prior to 1977-78. In Chicago, about 50% of teachers are minorities; in downstate Illinois, the percentage is 4-5%.

[25]See The School Code of Illinois, Article 21 and Rules to Govern the Certification of Teachers, Article VIII, especially Standard 10.

[26]See Standard 5 and Criterion 7, Article VIII, Rules to Govern the Certification of Teachers. A discussion of how this standard and criterion are applied appears in A Guide to Preparing Reports Concerning Teacher Education Institutions and Programs, Illinois State Board of Education.

[27]Study Report No. 2. The statement about the standards used for proficiency examinations is based on institutional reports, staff review of examinations and procedures, and discussions with higher education personnel.

[28]Unpublished study conducted by College of Education, Illinois State University, 1983.

[29]Percentages of transfer students were calculated using data in Table V-4, Data Book on Illinois Higher Education. The estimates regarding transfer students in teacher education programs are based on a telephone survey of public institutions.

[30]Study Report No. 2.

[31]The data summarized here are presented in Study Report No. 2. The data about failure rates are from national surveys of student teaching directors conducted by Dr. James Johnson and Northern Illinois University and John Yates, Southlands College of Education, London, in 1968 and 1982.

[32]Study Report No.3: Institutional Assessment of Prospective Educational Personnel in Graduate Programs, Illinois State Board of Education.

[33]The following discussion of the issues associated with the use of examinations in teacher certification is a summary of a more extensive discussion in Theodore E. Andrews, Current Issues in Teacher Education From a State Perspective, Prepared for the Northeast Regional Exchange, Inc., December, 1982, pp. 61-69.

[34]Study Report No. 4, p. 4.

[35]Data concerning beginning and returning teachers are from the Teacher Service Record and are annually reported in Illinois Supply and Demand Reports prepared by the Research and Statistics Section, Illinois State Board of Education.

[36]The data summarized here are from a survey of a sample of Illinois school districts. The data are reported in Study Report No. 1: District Selection and Assessment of Educational Personnel, Illinois State Board of Education.

[37]See State Board of Education Document 1, 2-2.3, 2-3.1 and Chapters VI and VII; also see The School Code of Illinois, 24-4.

[38]The data summarized in this section appear in Study Report No. 1.

[39]These figures were extrapolated to all districts based on the sample of the districts surveyed and reported on in Study Report No. 1. The extrapolation for contractual continued service teachers estimated that the mean number of teachers dismissed per year was .75. In the survey, 10.6% of the districts reported dismissing such a teacher. The result was .75 x (10.6% of 1,020 districts)=81. The same procedure was used in other instances. The resulting figures should be regarded as estimates only: (1) they are extrapolated from a sample and (2) based on self-reported data.

[40]California State Board of Education Guidelines for School Districts to Use in Developing Procedures for Evaluating Certificated Personnel, Sacramento, 1972.

[41]Donald M. Medley, Teacher Competency and the Teacher Educator, Association of Teacher Educators and the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Virginia, 1982, p. 39. Subsequent quotations from Medley appear on pp. 13 and 15.

[42]Seymour B. Sarason, "The School Culture and Processes of Change," quoted from Charles Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, New York, 1970, p. 321.

[43]See The School Code of Illinois, 24-11.

[44]See The School Code of Illinois, 10-21.4a and 34-8.1.

[45]This table is based on information in Illinois Teacher Salary Schedule and Contract Provision Study, 1981/82, Research and Statistics Section, Illinois State Board of Education; see specifically Table 34, pp. 37ff.

[46]Data taken from the Teacher Service Record.

[47]See Document 1, 4-2.6 and The School Code of Illinois, 3-11 and 12 and 18-8.

[48]See Study Report No. 1.

[49]The estimate of fees collected by Regional Superintendents is conservative since it is based only on the estimated number of currently employed teachers and does not include individuals registering certificates but not currently employed by public schools.

[50]See for instance, Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, "Transfer of Training : The Contribution of 'Coaching'," Journal of Education, Boston University School of Education (Spring, 1981), pp. 163-171; James Popham, "Assessing the Impact of Staff Development on Educational Improvement" in Professional Development, National Council of States on Inservice Education, Syracuse, New York, 1982, pp. 30-35.

[51]Joseph R. Ellis, Wesley Many, and D. Eugene Meyer, "Teacher Role Difficulties Reported by First Year Elementary Teachers in Illinois Public Schools" (mimeo); Judy M. Bischoff and Joseph R. Ellis, "Professional Difficulties Encountered by First Year Physical Education Teachers in Illinois Public Schools" (mimeo); see also First-Year Teacher Pilot Program: Final Report, University of Alabama in Birmingham (July, 1975), and Toward Meeting the Needs of the Beginning Teacher, ed. Kenneth Howey and Richard Bents, Midwest Teacher Corps Network and University of Minnesota/St. Paul Schools Teacher Corps Project, Minneapolis, 1979.

[52]This estimated interval between completion of preparation and assumption of administrative positions is based on data collected in a survey by the Illinois State Board of Education. The survey collected data from individuals who had occupied administrative positions for three years of less.

[53]Study Report No. 4.

[54]See The School Code of Illinois, 21-16.

[55]Data taken from Illinois Teacher Salary Schedule and Contract Provision Study, 1981/82.

Illinois
State Board of Education

100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Edward Copeland, Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

EDUCATION IS EVERYONE'S FUTURE

Bulk Rate
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 805
Springfield, IL

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois
June 1983 7.5M 3-1044B-77 No. 354